



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/014,087	01/27/1998	WENDA C. CARLYLE	1416.25US01	4103

24113 7590 11/29/2001

PATTERSON, THUENTE, SKAAR & CHRISTENSEN, P.A.
4800 IDS CENTER
80 SOUTH 8TH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2100

EXAMINER

PREBILIC, PAUL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3738

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/014,087

Applicant(s)

CARLYLE ET AL.

Examiner

Paul B. Prebilib

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11,14,15 and 21-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-11,14,15 and 21-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3738

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9-11, 14, and 21-29 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4, 8-11, 13, and 15 of copending Application No. 09/186,810.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of the copending claims is so similar to the present claimed subject matter that it reads on it and is at least clearly obvious thereover.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 3738

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The language "plurality of reactive functional groups" lacks clear original support for the entire range. Instead, "two reactive groups" per molecule is disclosed not the entire range of 'two or more' as set forth; see page 14, line 28 of the specification. For this reason, it is the Examiner's position that the present claim 29 contains new matter with respect to the original disclosure.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed range of a plurality of reactive groups appears to refer to a per molecule basis but this is unclear. Alternatively, the claim language could be interpreted to mean that there are a plurality of reactive groups in a plurality of crosslinking molecules. For this reason, it is unclear how the language should be interpreted and what the scope of the claim is intended to be. If the language is interpreted in the latter manner than it would not constitute new matter with respect to the original disclosure but would be indefinite because it can be interpreted in two ways.

Art Unit: 3738

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cahalan (US 5,308,641) wherein the human or animal tissue is used as the solid surface and the biomolecule is one of the growth factors listed on column 6, lines 14-18; see the whole document, especially the abstract, column 4, lines 20-43, and column 6, lines 8-28. It is noted that "fixed" and "crosslinked" are synonymous in the tissue graft implant art.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bayne et al (EP 0476983) wherein the fibrin coating is applied prior to the VEGF II growth factors to the surface of the fixed umbilical cord vein; see the whole document, especially page 8, lines 14-26, and in particular, page 8, lines 20-23.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9-11, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayne et al (EP 0476893) in view of Wadstrom (US 5,631,011).

Art Unit: 3738

Bayne et al discloses an implant having a fibrin coating (a biologic adhesive as claimed) which is applied prior to the VEGF II growth factor (VEGF II is the polypeptide growth factor as claimed). The fixed umbilical cord vein of Bayne et al is the substrate for coating as claimed; see page 8, lines 14-26. However, the Bayne et al cord vein, although a crosslinked human or animal tissue, is not clear either an allograft or xenograft as claimed. Nonetheless, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been considered clearly obvious to an ordinary artisan to use an allograft or xenograft tissue for the cord vein of Bayne et al absent some showing of criticality therefor. Wadstrom is cited to show that fibrin is a common biologic tissue adhesive in the art, and thus, the fibrin coating of Bayne et al can be called and would function as a biologic adhesive as claimed.

Claims 6-8, 14, 15, 21-24, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayne et al and Wadstrom as applied to claims 1-5, 9-11, and 29 above, and further in view of Carpentier (US 4,648,881). Bayne et al fails to disclose uncrosslinked tissue, the heart valve form of the tissue, or the other tissue types as claimed. However, Carpentier teaches that all uncrosslinked and crosslinked forms of tissue, heart valve tissue forms and other types of tissue are all well known in the art; see the entire document. Hence, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use any of these materials as the substrate of Bayne et al for the applications contemplated by Carpentier.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 27, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the traversal of the Cahalan Section 102(b) rejection that Cahalan is not drawn to a crosslinked tissue (see page 5 of the response filed August 27, 2001), the Examiner posits that the animal tissue is the solid surface but that the polyalkylimine is part of the tissue to the extent claimed and at least it is crosslinked to render a crosslinked tissue. Furthermore, a crosslinking step would also crosslink the underlying solid surface of animal tissue because the polyalkylimine would not perfectly seal the surface.

Next, Applicants argue that the light crosslinking of Cahalan is not the crosslinking network implied by the present claim language. However, the Examiner posits that light crosslinking is only a preference of Cahalan. Furthermore, the claims do not require a crosslinked network either explicitly or implicitly so this argument is considered unpersuasive. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to the argument that Bayne et al is to an application of cells not VEGF II to a surface, the Examiner posits that both an embodiment of cells application and an embodiment of straight VEGF II application is disclosed by Bayne et al; see page 8, lines 20 et seq. For this reason, the Applicants' arguments are considered unpersuasive in view of the second embodiment.

Art Unit: 3738

Applicants' argue that Bayne does not disclose fixed tissue. However, Applicants are directed to line 19 of page 8 where "fixed umbilical vein" is disclosed as an example of the artificial blood vessel.

In response to the argument that fibrin is not an adhesive once polymerized, the Examiner notes that Bayne et al discloses that fibrin can be used as an aid in the attachment of cells, and thus, it has an adhesive function and can be called an adhesive for that reason. Furthermore, Wadstrom teaches the use of fibrin to attach tissue layers together. For this reason and because Bayne et al uses fibrin to attach cells, the Examiner posits that it would have been clearly obvious to use the Wadstrom adhesive as the fibrin of Bayne et al.

Applicants note that an incorrect patent number has been used for Carpentier. In response, the Examiner has corrected the patent number in the rejection.

Finally, Applicants argue that Wadstrom and Carpentier do not disclose the use of growth factors therewith. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Since they were used to teach the use of other components with Bayne, it is not persuasive to traverse them on the basis of what Bayne et al discloses.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


Art Unit: 3738

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Prebilic whose telephone number is (703) 308-2905. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on (703) 308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3580.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.


Paul Prebilic
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738

Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier)
6/18/01

The below text replaces the pre-printed text under the heading, "Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes," on the back of the PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier) form.

INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES

1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the Notice of Allowability. Extensions of time may **NOT** be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

Timing of Corrections

Applicant is required to submit the drawing corrections within the time period set in the attached Office communication. See 37 CFR 1.85(a)

Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.